



Comprehensive
Planning
Council

Conseil de
planification
globale

Government
Publications

REPORT

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON LAND USE OPTIONS TEMAGAMI AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROGRAM MAY - AUGUST, 1994



INTRODUCTION

Public consultation by the Comprehensive Planning Council (CPC) on options for future land use in the comprehensive plan commenced on May 5, 1994. All public input received will be taken into account in preparing the comprehensive plan; this report summarizes input received up to August 31, 1994.

CPC is a citizens' advisory committee, with representatives appointed by Ontario and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai. Council's primary mandate is to recommend a comprehensive plan for the Temagami area to these parties by March, 1996. The plan will address Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, Crown land recreation, cultural heritage, fisheries, fire, landscape ecology, minerals, provincial parks, tourism, timber, water and wildlife management. The Ministries of Natural Resources (MNR); Northern Development and Mines (MNDM); and Culture, Tourism and Recreation (MCTR) are providing professional support to council in the preparation of this plan.

BACKGROUND

The Temagami Area Comprehensive Planning Program (CPP) was launched in 1989 in response to government direction that there be "model" management of the resources of the Temagami area. Upon completion, the plan will, among other things, replace the existing document governing area Crown land and resource management - the 1983 MNR Temagami District Land Use Guidelines (DLUG). Initially, the Temagami Advisory Council (TAC), a citizens' advisory committee to Ontario, took on responsibility for recommending the plan to the Minister of Natural Resources.

In May, 1991, the Minister replaced TAC with CPC to, among other things, "...strengthen the role of local communities in the management of natural resources in the Temagami area". The Teme-Augama Anishnabai agreed to join CPC in April, 1993 as an interim measure. Council is now co-chaired and has 15 members.

METHOD

In this phase of consultation, council sought public input on broad questions about land use across the planning area: In what areas should the permitted uses be allowed to occur? And in these areas, how much use should occur?

Beginning in May, CPC hosted open houses and workshops in Temagami, Haileybury, Field and Elk Lake. The open houses were attended by a total of 350 persons; of these people, 180 went on to participate in evening workshops. These were followed by 14 informal meetings with a 171 representatives of various organizations, interest groups and municipalities in Elk Lake, Latchford, New Liskeard, Sturgeon Falls, Temagami and Toronto.

Participants at the open houses and workshops, along with other interested members of the public, received an information kit which contained: the principles and "givens" guiding the planning process; the planning objectives; a map and criteria depicting the present level of activity in the planning area; three potential land use scenarios and associated criteria for planning; and, a description of how resource management would occur in each future scenario. The public was encouraged to draw their own scenarios and to provide written and verbal input.

The deadline for this round of consultation was initially set at July 15, 1994. To accommodate a number of individuals and organizations who approached CPC with requests for meetings following this date, council extended its consultation period to August 31, 1994. As of that date, 277 pieces of correspondence and verbal communications had been received. Since the end of the consultation period, additional correspondence has also been received and will be taken into account in the planning process.

CONSULTATION SUMMARY: WHAT WE HEARD FROM YOU

Council received a wide array of views from the public at the meetings and in correspondence. The views expressed can be categorized into: key messages; the objectives of the planning process; the land use zoning approach; and other issues.

KEY MESSAGES

- many divergent views were expressed about what and how much resource use should occur in the area
- some publics were of the view that the land use proposals were very restrictive toward land and resource use, whereas others were of the opinion that not nearly enough was being done to protect the area's environment
- there was disagreement between those who support continued use of some the area's resources for industrial purposes (e.g., sustainable forestry and mineral management) versus those who advocate setting the area aside to maintain large functioning ecosystems, biodiversity, and wilderness, aesthetic and intrinsic values
- most advocates of continued resource use felt that Scenario 3 was too restrictive and most advocates of further environmental protection felt that Scenario 1 did not afford enough protection
- some publics and organizations expressed opposition to the planning program on the basis that it is unsound and ill-conceived

CPC PLANNING OBJECTIVES

Local and traditional users

- many concerns were expressed that the land use proposals would deny traditional users continued access to the area's resources, and adversely impact lifestyles
- concern was expressed about the collective effect that various initiatives would have upon this access, e.g., Keep It Wild, Areas of Natural Scientific Interest, old-growth sites
- fairness in users' access to land and resources was raised on a number of occasions

Fire Management

- to take advantage of the natural benefits of fire, some support for the possibility that natural fires may be permitted to burn under pre-determined criteria
- concerns about protection of persons and property were raised

- some publics also expressed the view that continued, intensive fire responses were necessary to ensure stability in the supply of wood for industrial purposes

Cottaging

- few comments were received with respect to the use of Crown land for cottaging; those that were offered qualified support for it subject to site selection occurring through a sound, legitimate planning process

Access

- many views were received on the question of access to land and resources, ranging from unrestricted access, which included the removal of existing gates, and new areas being opened up as required, to no new access and additional controls on existing points of entry
- proposals to prohibit motorized access in certain areas raised concerns, e.g. non-commercial aircraft into certain parks
- some publics raised site-specific issues, whereas other input applied to all of the planning area

Timber Management

- some publics expressed the view that timber harvesting should not be permitted at all in the area, particularly in any "old growth" areas such as the White Bear Forest; others raised concerns about specific areas
- concerns were raised that the land-base for forest management activities was becoming substantially smaller, and underutilized
- with a reduced land-base, the viability of the area's forest products industry was drawn into question by some people
- some publics expressed opposition to clear-cut timber harvesting
- some publics expressed support for modified timber harvesting prescriptions, e.g., selective cutting
- concern was expressed by some publics that not enough was being done to regenerate the area's forests through planting and tending

Fisheries Management

- concern was expressed that the land use proposals would result in too many restrictions on the public's fishing opportunities, and that traditional levels of use ought to continue
- public concern was also expressed about overharvesting of the area's fisheries and the need to protect their ecological integrity
- comments were provided with respect to specific resource management strategies that could be used to control fishing effort, e.g., lake closures, shortened seasons, slot sizes

Wildlife Management

- some publics said that area wildlife and habitat integrity should be protected from further human encroachment
- some publics said that traditional hunting and trapping opportunities should continue
- some publics questioned the soundness of using landscape corridors as a tool for management of wildlife habitat

Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs)

- some people questioned the rationale for ANSIs and felt them to be an extension of parks
- others expressed support for their establishment and protection

Provincial Parks

- comments relating to parks ranged from modifying policy to permit multiple-use such as timber harvesting and mining, to expanding the boundaries of the area parks
- most comments received related to Lady Evelyn-Smoothwater Provincial Park (LESW)
- some publics and municipalities expressed the view that some existing uses in LESW should be permitted to continue (e.g., use of the Liskeard Lumber Road for forest access, snowmobile trails), and that the park's classification ought to be changed to allow this
- some publics, including non-commercial pilots, felt that industry would receive preferential treatment in limiting aircraft access to certain commercial operators
- some publics expressed support for land use proposals that would support park-related values through conservation reserves, while others felt that any limitation on extractive uses amounted to a de facto expansion of park boundaries and opposed any form of buffers

Crown Land Recreation

- most comments were about canoeing and snowmobiling
- some publics and industry said that the existing network of area canoe routes should be protected and enhanced through management, and alluded to the provincial and North American significance of the area for this activity
- concern was expressed about overuse and garbage left as a result of various recreational activities
- some expressed the view that existing area trails and canoe portages must be maintained
- some said that the type, size and speed of boats on lakes ought to be controlled, whereas others felt that there ought to be no restrictions
- there was disagreement as to whether snowmobiling contributes more to the area's economy than does canoeing

Aggregate Resources

- few comments received with respect to aggregate resources; comments were made with reference to extraction at several specific locations

Mineral Management

- some publics and industry advocated mining, whereas others objected to re-opening the area to this activity
- some public and industry opposition to the zoning concept, proposals to prohibit staking in certain areas (i.e., Light Green Zone) and the requirement that there be zoning amendments in certain areas (e.g., Yellow Zone) to commence advanced exploration
- concern was expressed that land use zoning would be a significant disincentive to prospective investors
- some publics expressed the view that there ought to be no mining in the area due to the adverse effects of past mining activities, particularly upon water quality and aesthetics

- other publics and industry noted the importance of keeping as large a land-base as possible open for staking as only a small percentage of sites result in economically-viable deposits which comprise a small area
- some felt that stringent provisions under the amended Mining Act, including provisions for rehabilitation, was sufficient, and viewed land use planning as unnecessary

Cultural Heritage Resources

- few comments were received with respect to this objective
- questions were raised regarding the extent to which heritage sites will receive protection

Tourism

- some publics and industry expressed concern about the impact that the land use scenarios would have on the area's existing, particularly remote, tourism operations
- some felt that there was an overemphasis on backcountry recreation, at the expense of tourism that relies upon motorized access
- some publics expressed the view that tourism operators receive preferential access to land and resources, and that this should be stopped
- some expressed the view that more ought to be done to promote tourism in the area

Viewscales

- comments were received that the Lake Temagami skyline reserve ought to remain as it is, and that no mainland development should be permitted; alternatively, some suggested that some commercial timber harvesting and/or measures to maintain the reserve's aesthetics should be considered

Water

- some publics expressed the view that there ought to be larger buffers between waterbodies and various uses
- some said that existing guidelines were sufficient to protect headwaters
- management on a watershed basis was advocated by some, and others felt that the public ought to have more input into decision-making on water level manipulation

THE LAND USE ZONING APPROACH

- concern was expressed about the merits of the zoning approach
- the lack of specificity in the land use proposals was raised as a concern
- some publics questioned the need for zoning on the basis that existing legal, regulatory requirements and guidelines were sufficient

OTHER ISSUES

- questions were raised with regard to the manner in which the plan would apply to aboriginal people, and how their rights would be respected and exercised
- some publics felt that the proposals were too complex to give them adequate consideration in the time allotted



3 1761 11547130 2

- a number of publics and municipalities expressed concern that the socio-economic impacts of the proposals were not presented and that proper staff were not performing this work
- some people felt that the plan should be flexible, and provide opportunities for amendment from time-to-time
- some members of the public, municipalities and the Elk Lake Community Forest said that comprehensive planning should be stopped, particularly in an 11-township area at the southern end of the Elk Lake Crown Management Unit

PUBLIC RECORD

Minutes of public meetings, and correspondence and minutes of informal meetings (unless privacy is requested) are part of the public record, and are available for review at CPC's office on Lakeshore Drive in Temagami.

A number of questions about CPC, the planning process and the land use proposals were raised during this phase of consultation. It was not possible to answer all of these questions in the meetings or return correspondence. These questions were recorded and answers have now been prepared. Unless privacy was requested, these questions and answers also form part of the public record, and are available for viewing at CPC's office.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Persons wishing to obtain further information about the Comprehensive Planning Program are invited to contact Michael Cartan, CPP Co-ordinator, at (705) 569-3622. Persons seeking information about council and the public consultation process, or who wish to arrange to view the public record, are asked to contact Paul King-Fisher, CPC Resource Co-ordinator, at (705) 569-2744.

With the exception of planning for timber management activities, the Comprehensive Planning Process is not subject to the Environmental Assessment Act (R.S.O. 1990, Chap. E.18). Planning for timber management activities (access, harvest, renewal and maintenance) is being done in a manner that complies with Exemption Order MNR 11/10 made under the Act. A copy of this order is available upon request. All comments become part of the public record unless privacy is requested.

